

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 00764 121837Z

67

ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 AEC-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-07 IO-10 L-02

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05 ACDA-05

BIB-01 /082 W

----- 129481

R 121645Z FEB 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 071

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T USNATO 0764

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: AIR MANPOWER: WG STUDY OF US PROPOSALS

REF: A) USNATO 560; B) USNATO 686; C) STATE 31590; D) STATE 263866

1. WG DEVOTED ENTIRE MEETING FEBRUARY 11 TO DRAFT PAPER ON US AIR MANPOWER PROPOSALS. UK REP (GEHRATY) PROPOSED NUMEROUS CHANGES. FRG REP (DZIALAS) DREW FROM PREVIOUS GUIDANCE EMPHASIZING NEED FOR THOROUGH STUDY. BELGIAN REP (WILLOT) DISCUSSED PROBLEMS HE SAW IN US PROPOSALS. US REP (MCCORMACK) REVIEWED US RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ON US AIR MANPOWER PAPER. WG REPS EXPRESSED APPRECIATION FOR THIS MATERIAL. WG REQUESTED STAFF TO CIRCULATE REVISED DRAFT PAPER WHICH WE WILL TRANSMIT BY SEPTTEL ON RECEIPT.

2. COMMENT: WG WILL RETURN TO DRAFT PAPER ON US PROPOSALS AT FEBRUARY 18 MEETING, BUT IS MOST UNLIKELY TO COMPLETE WORK ON THIS PAPER DURING NEXT TWO OR THREE MEETINGS. WASHINGTON MAY WISH  
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 00764 121837Z

TO COMMENT ON SOME OF THE QUESTIONS REPORTED BELOW DEPENDING ON THEIR RELEVANCE IN LIGHT OF CURRENT REVIEW (REF C). MISSION BELIEVES THE SUB-CEILING ISSUE DISCUSSED IN PARA 3 B BELOW WILL REMAIN RELEVANT UNDER ANY US PROPOSAL ON AIR MANPOWER, AS

LONG AS US ADVOCATES NON- EXPLICIT SERVICE SUB-CEILINGS.  
ACTION REQUESTED: 1) RESPONSE TO USNATO 686 ON MARGINS  
GOVERNING POST REDUCTION FREEDOM-TO-MIX UNDER US PROPOSAL  
FOR NON-EXPLICIT SERVICE SUB-CEILINGS; AND 2) GUIDANCE ON BELGIAN  
REPS COMMENT IN PARA 3 B BELOW.

3. FOLLOWING ARE PRINCIPAL ISSUES WG REPS RAISED AT  
FEBRUARY 11 MEETING.

A. PRECEDENT FOR PHASE II. FRG REP ADVOCATED MORE  
DETAILED EXPLANATION OF IMPLICATION OF US PROPOSALS AS  
PRECEDENT FOR PHASE II. BELGIAN REP SAID US WAS PROPOSING  
THAT ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS BE ALLOWED TO CHOOSE WHEHTER  
TO INCLUDE AIR MANPOWER IN PHASE II REDUCTIONS. THIS APPROACH  
COULD RESULT IN ELIMINATION OR INEQUALITY IN CEILING ON GROUND  
FORCES AND ENTAIL CUMBERSOME NON-CIRCUMVENTION PROVISIONS.  
BELGIAN REP SAID 700,000 COMMON CEILING ON GROUND FORCES  
WAS FUNDAMENTAL TO ALLIED POSITION AND MUST BE RETAINED.  
PAPER SHOULD THS ANALYZE IN DETAIL IMPLICATIONS OF US PROPOSAL  
FOR PHASE II INCLUDING IMPACT ON EUROPEAN FORCES AND CAPABILITIES.  
US REP REVIEWED US PROPOSALS (PARA 7, REF B) AND US ASSURANCES  
(PARA 8, REF B). HE SUGGESTED PAPER RETAIN  
FOCUS ON US PROPOSALS AND NOT SHIFT TO EXTENSIVE ELABORATION  
ON PHASE II. UKS REP INDICATED HE HAD EARLIER UNDERSTOOD THAT  
CONCEPT OF OPTIONAL REDUCTIONS OF AIR MANPOWER IN PHASE II  
WOULD BE INTEGRAL PART OF PROPOSAL TO OTHER SIDE. HE  
SUGGESTED THAT REVISED PARA 3 OF WG PAPER CLARIFY THIS ISSUE.

B. SUB-CEILINGS. UK REP SUGGESTED PARA 12 D OF PAPER SAY  
THAT SINCE US PROPOSAL IMPOSES NO SUB-CEILINGS ON AIR OR GROUND  
MANPOWER IT WOULD BE UNNECESSARY TO ADDRESS ANOMALIES OR TO  
DEFINE GROUND OR AIR FORCES. FRG REP SAID PARA SHOULD STIPULATE  
THAT WITHOUT SUB-CEILINGS IT WOULD BE NECESSARY TO HAVE NON-CIR-  
CUMVENTION PROVISION TO PREVENT SOVIETS FROM REINFORCING GROUND  
FORCES AT EXPENSE OF AIR MANPOWER. TO CLARIFY US APPROACH,  
US REP REVIEWED PROPOSAL FOR LIMITED FREEDOM TO MIX WITH  
NON-EXPLICIT CEILINGS AND NON-CIRCUMVENTION WHICH WE  
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 00764 121837Z

SUBMITTED TO SPC JANUARY 16 (LAST TWO PARAS IN PART II OF REF D).  
BELGIAN REP EXPRESSED VIEW THAT US APPROACH TO SUB-CEILINGS ISSUE  
COULD WEAKEN COMMON CEILING ON GROUND FORCES OF ABOUT 700,000 WHICH  
HE BELIEVED MUST REMAIN CENTRAL WESTERN OBJECTIVE. HE NOTED THAT  
US DOES NOT FAVOR A COMMON SUB-CEILING ON GROUND FORCES OF 700,000,  
BUT RATHER NON-EXPLICIT SUB-CEILINGS. HOWEVER, US PROPOSAL  
ON AIR MANPOWER SAYS NOTHING ABOUT SHARE OF GROUND VS. AIR  
MANPOWER DEDUCTIONS IN PHASE II. THUS THE POST REDUCTION  
GROUND FORCE LEVEL EMERGING FROM PHASE II, WHICH THE US NON-  
EXPLICIT SUB-CEILINGS WOULD GOVERN, COULD BE CONSIDERABLY DIFFERENT  
FROM 700,000. UK REP EXPRESSED PREFERENCE FOR US APPROACH  
RATHER THAN RELIANCE ON GROUND CEILING. HE AND OTHER REPS  
REQUESTED US VIEWS ON WHAT ALTERATION OF SERVICE

MANPOWER RELATIONSHIPS MIGHT BE PERMITTED UNDER US NON-EXPLICIT SUB-CEILING PROPOSAL. THEY BELIEVED FURTHER CLARIFICATION OF WORD "SIGNIFICANTLY" IN US FORMULATION (REF D) WAS ESSENTIAL TO UNDERSTANDING OF THIS ISSUE.

C. CIVILIZATION. BELGIAN REP BELIEVED WEST MUST RETAIN BROAD FLEXIBILITY TO UTILIZE CIVILIAN MANPOWER SUPPORT AND EXPRESSED CONCERN THAT IMMEDIATE CIVILIANIZATION TO COMPENSATE FOR AIR MANPOWER REDUCTIONS COULD SOMEHOW LEAD OTHER SIDE TO DEMAND STRICT NON-CIRCUMVENTION REGARDING CIVILIANIZATION.

D. US GROUND MANPOWER REDUCTIONS. UK REP REQUESTED US CONFIRM THAT ANY ADDITIONAL US PHASE I GROUND FORCE REDUCTIONS UNDER THE US PROPOSAL WOULD NOT AFFECT US M-DAY COMBAT FORMATIONS AND THAT SUCH REDUCTIONS COULD BE MADE BY THIN-OUT.

E. EFFECT OF PROPOSALS ON WP. FRG REP EMPHASIZED BONN'S INTEREST IN ATTEMPTING TO DRAW QUANTITATIVE CONCLUSIONS REGARDING EFFECTS OF US PROPOSALS ON SOVIET AND WP.

4. UK REP CIRCULATED SPEAKING NOTES CONTAINING FOLLOWING SUGGESTION WHICH WG DID NOT DISCUSS: "THE WG PAPER SHOULD SAY WHETHER OR NOT ANY SAFEGUARDS SHOULD BE INTRODUCED FOR PHASE II OVER AND ABOVE THOSE PROPOSED IN THE US PROPOSALS. IF IT WERE DECIDED THAT NATO COULD NOT AFFORD TO ALLOW THE WP TO REDUCE THEIR GROUND FORCE PERSONNEL BY LESS THAN SAY 150,000 MEN IN PHASE II, IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE TO MODIFY THE US PROPOSALS OF 15 JANUARY  
SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 00764 121837Z

1975 BY STIPULATING THAT IN PHASE II BOTH SIDES COULD EFFECT MANPOWER REDUCTIONS IN AIR AND GROUND FORCE PERSONNEL ON A BASIS, FOR EXAMPLE, PROPORTIONAL TO THEIR POST PHASE I AIR AND GROUND FORCE LEVELS. THE ADVANTAGE OF SUCH A MODIFICATION FOR NATO WOULD BE THAT THE WP WOULD HAVE TO TAKE SOME 9/11TH OF THEIR PHASE II REDUCTIONS IN GROUND FORCE PERSONNEL (I.E. ABOUT 156,000 MEN); THE DISADVANTAGE FOR NATO WOULD BE THAT IT WOULD ITSELF HAVE TO TAKE SOME 1/4 OF ITS PHASE II REDUCTIONS (I.E. 13,000 MEN) IN AIR MANPOWER. ON BALANCE IT WOULD APPEAR THAT IT WOULD NOT BE IN NATO'S INTEREST TO PUT FORWARD SUCH A MODIFICATION, ALTHOUGH SUCH A MODIFICATION MIGHT BE PROPOSED IN DUE COURSE BY THE WP."  
BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 18 AUG 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 12 FEB 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975NATO00764  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19750286/abbrzidy.tel  
**Line Count:** 156  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** A) USNATO 560; B) USNATO 686; C) STATE 31590; D) STATE 263866  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** GolinoFR  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 04 APR 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <04 APR 2003 by BoyleJA>; APPROVED <07 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
05 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: AIR MANPOWER: WG STUDY OF US PROPOSALS  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO BONN  
LONDON  
MBFR VIENNA  
USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR

**Type:** TE

**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006